

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/009,180	05/09/2002	Jean-Louis Mercier	08641-021001	6190
7	590 04/20/2004		EXAMINER	
Fish & Richardson			VARGOT, MATHIEU D	
225 Franklin Street Boston, MA 02110-2804			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Boston, WA	02110-2004		1732	

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		17
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/009,180	MERCIER, JEAN-LOUIS	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mathieu D. Vargot	1732	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a re y within the statutory minimum of thirty will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT . cause the application to become AB	ply be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 M	lay 2003.		
,	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under E			
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 53-75 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 53-75 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1.☐ Certified copies of the priority document 2.☐ Certified copies of the priority document 3.☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in A nity documents have been u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview S Paper No(s	ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date	
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/29.6/13.5/27. 	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	formal Patent Application (PTO-152)	



Application/Control Number: 10/009,180

Art Unit: 1732

1. Claims 67 and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 67 and 68 are indefinite in that the meaning of "a position... being adjusted" is uncertain. The specification supports the aspect of the molds being positioned a distance away from each other—and staying that distance away-- but it is not really clear that is what is being specified. It should be clearly set forth in claim 67 that the 1mm recited is the distance between the molds. In claim 68, it is unclear how the second mold can contact the periphery of the first mold and yet define a mold cavity between the two molds. Clarification is required.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 53, 55, 56, 59, 62, 64, 66, 69-71, 73 and 75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schuler (col. 1, line 20; col. 3, lines 43-46; col. 5, lines 53-57; col. 8, lines 46-53).

Schuler discloses the instant process for molding a non-circular lens (the disclosure of the rubber spacer having a non-circular cross-section at col. 5, lines 53-57 inherently would mean that the molds would also have to be non-circular, otherwise they would not fit on the spacer/gasket) adapted to a wearer's prescription and such that the lens would not require any grinding or polishing (see disclosure at col. 3, lines 43-46—hence, the

Application/Control Number: 10/009,180

Art Unit: 1732

lens is submitted to have been molded in the desired shape, which inherently would mean the shape of the frame which the lens would be fitted in) by supplying the necessary non-circular molds, molding and curing a setting material between the molds and removing the cured lens from the molds. At column 8, lines 46-53, Schuler discloses curing the lens within the mold assembly, removing the lens from the mold and annealing same for a period of time to remove stresses. It is submitted that this inherently includes the aspects of performing a partial curing, removal of mold positioning devices after the partial curing (ie, the rubber spacer/gasket) and a total curing, since annealing is quite commonly used to complete the curing of a lens. Ie, not only would annealing remove stresses, but it would inherently advance the degree of cure while doing so. The molds (ie, second mold) are positioned in a horizontal manner.

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 54, 57, 58, 60, 61, 63, 65, 67, 68, 72 and 74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schuler.

Schuler discloses the basic claimed method as set forth in paragraph 2, supra, the applied reference essentially lacking a teaching of trimming the molds to provide the non-circular shape, the length of the curing steps, the use of irradiation for the curing, thermal shock for the release and the exact thickness of the mold cavity. Certainly,

circular molds are most common in the lens molding art and it would have been within the skill level of the art to trim or mill such a conventional mold so that it would be of the desired non-circular shape. The additional aspects found lacking in Schuler are submitted to be quite well known in the art and would have been obvious modifications to the process therein to facilitate producing the lens. For instance, irradiation is widely used as such is generally faster than thermal curing. Using irradiation in lieu of the heating in Schuler for the curing would clearly have reduced the curing time. Thermal shock for release of lens from molds is well known and would have been an obvious modification to the process of the applied reference to facilitate the release of the lens without damaging it. Finally, the thickness of the mold cavity would have been an obvious feature dependent on the thickness of the desired lens.

Page 4

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Pickering press molds glass in non-circular shapes. Japanese Patent 7-227882 makes rectangular lenses by injection molding.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mathieu D. Vargot whose telephone number is 571 272-1211. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 9 to 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Colaianni, can be reached on 71 272-1196. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

Application/Control Number: 10/009,180

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 1732

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

M. Vargot April 17, 2004 Mathieu D. Vargot **Primary Examiner** Art Unit 1732

M. Vargot

Page 5

4/17/04